UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,309	12/18/2003	Masaki Kashiwagi	CFA00027US	5665

34904   7590   12/02/2008
CANON U.S.A. INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
15975 ALTON PARKWAY
IRVINE, CA 92618-3731

EXAMINER
SINGH, SATWANT K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/742,309	KASHIWAGI, MASAKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SATWANT K. SINGH	2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 September 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the

fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection.

Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114,

and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the

previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 03 September 2003 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2.   This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 03 September

2008.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kita et al. (US 6,961,139)in view of Michiie et al. (US 6,980,702).

6.   .Regarding Claim 1, Kita et al teaches an image processing apparatus

comprising: an image reading unit configured to read image data of a document

(scanner section 12); an image storage unit configured to store the image data

read by the image reading unit (image memory 14); a display unit configured to

display the image data stored in the image storage unit (monitor section 33); a

reading control unit configured to perform a successive reading operation,

wherein, in the successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets

divided from a series of document sheets are independently read by the image

reading unit (image on each document is read one by one, so as to read the

images residing on a plurality of documents), and image data corresponding to

the read plural sets of document sheets is stored in the image storage unit as a

series of image data corresponding to the series of document sheets (image

data, read by scanning section is compressed by the compression/expansion

circuit and stored in image memory) (col. 8, lines 16-32, col. 9, line 49-col. 10,

line 7); and a control unit configured to enable the display unit to display image

data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of document

sheets in the successive reading operation (displaying images based on the

image data read from the hard-disk) (col. 8, lines 59-65).

Kita fails to teach an apparatus, comprising: a reading unit configured to

read documents until a read-end command is input, and an image outputting unit

configured to collectively output the plural sets of document sheets stored in the

image storage unit as the series of image data when the read-end command is

input.

Mitchiie et al teaches an apparatus, comprising: a reading unit (reading unit 20) configured to read documents until a read-end command is input (Fig. 16, S14) (CPU sends a read request to the image storing device) (col. 11, lines 35-44), and an image outputting unit configured to collectively output the plural sets of document sheets stored in the image storage unit as the series of image data when the read-end command is input (Fig. 16, repetition of steps 14 through 16) (col. 11, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Mitchiie to allow for the storage and output of mass image data.

7.   Regarding Claim 2, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data at an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets, the second reading process being performed after the first reading process.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data at an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets (image data representative of a plurality of documents may be sequentially written to the divided portions of the area of the video memory corresponding to a single paper sheet) (col. 6, lines 9-16), the second reading process being performed after the

first reading process (plurality of documents sequentially written) (col. 6, lines 9-
38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at
the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching
of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually
verify the documents that have just been scanned.

8.   Regarding Claim 3, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing
apparatus, further comprising: a command acceptance unit configured to accept
the read-end command in the successive reading operation, wherein, in the
successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display
the stored image data before the command acceptance unit accepts the read-
end command.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a
command acceptance unit configured to accept the read-end command in the
successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation
(address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32), the control
unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the
command acceptance unit accepts the read- end command (input and output of
image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at
the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching
of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually
verify the documents that have just been scanned.

9.   Regarding Claim 4, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the second reading process is started.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32), the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data before the second reading process is started (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

10.   Regarding Claim 5, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data after completion of the first reading process and before the second reading process is started.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein, in the successive reading operation, the control unit enables the display unit to display the stored image data after completion of the first reading process and before the second reading process is started (input and output of image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

11.   Regarding Claim 7, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled (CPU is capable of transferring the image data read out of the image data to the operation panel vial the I/O panel) (col. 6, lines 33-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to visually verify the images that have been scanned.

12.   Regarding Claim 8, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of the read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of the read-end command in

the successive reading operation is enabled (address and data lines for reading

and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching

of Michiie to allow a user to end the scanning process.

13.   Regarding Claim 10, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing

apparatus, further comprising: a suspending instruction unit configured to instruct

suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document

sheets and resume the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is

provided by the suspending instruction unit.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising: a

suspending instruction unit configured to instruct suspension of the successive

reading operation for the series of document sheets and resume the suspended

reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the suspending instruction

unit (Fig. 9) (col. 7, lines 23-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching

of Michiie to allow a user to control the timing of the scanning process.

14.

15.   Regarding Claim 11 and 21, Kita et al teaches an image processing

method comprising: performing a successive reading operation, wherein, in the

successive reading operation, plural sets of document sheets divided from a

series of document sheets are independently read (image on each document is

read one by one, so as to read the images residing on a plurality of documents),

and image data corresponding to the read plural sets of document sheets is

stored in an image storage unit as a series of image data corresponding to the

series of document sheets (image data, read by scanning section is compressed

by the compression/expansion circuit and stored in image memory) (col. 8, lines

16-32, col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 7); and allowing a display unit to display the

stored image data corresponding to the read image data after reading each set of

document sheets in the successive reading operation (displaying images based

on the image data read from the hard-disk) (col. 8, lines 59-65).

Kita fails to teach a method comprising: reading the documents are read

until a read-end command is input, and outputting, collectively, the plural sets of

document sheets stored in the image storage unit as the series of image data

when the read-end command is input

Mitchiie et al teaches a method comprising: reading the documents are

read until a read-end command is input (Fig. 16, S14) (CPU sends a read

request to the image storing device) (col. 11, lines 35-44), and outputting,

collectively, the plural sets of document sheets stored in the image storage unit

as the series of image data when the read-end command is input (Fig. 16,

repetition of steps 14 through 16) (col. 11, lines 49-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching

of Mitchiie to allow for the storage and output of mass image data.

16.   Regarding Claims 12 and 22, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets, the second reading process being performed after the first reading process.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed an interval between a first reading process for one divided set of document sheets and a second reading process for another divided set of document sheets (image data representative of a plurality of documents may be sequentially written to the divided portions of the area of the video memory corresponding to a single paper sheet) (col. 6, lines 9-16), the second reading process being performed after the first reading process (plurality of documents sequentially written) (col. 6, lines 9-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually verify the documents that have just been scanned.

17.   Regarding Claims 13 and 23, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, further comprising: accepting the read-end command in the successive reading operation, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display unit is allowed before the read-end command is accepted.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, further comprising:
accepting the read-end command in the successive reading operation (address
and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32), wherein, in the
successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display
unit is allowed before the read-end command is accepted (input and output of
image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at
the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching
of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually
verify the documents that have just been scanned.

18.   Regarding Claims 14 and 24, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing
method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored
image data by the display unit is allowed before the second reading process is
started.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein, in the
successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display
unit is allowed before the second reading process is started (input and output of
image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at
the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching
of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually
verify the documents that have just been scanned.

19.   Regarding Claims 15 and 25 Kita et al fails to teach an image processing
method, wherein, in the successive reading operation, displaying of the stored
image data by the display unit is allowed after completion of the first reading
process and before the second reading process is started (input and output of
image data executed at the same time) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

         Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at
the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching
of Michiie to sequentially display the scanned documents so the user can visually
verify the documents that have just been scanned.

         Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein, in the
successive reading operation, displaying of the stored image data by the display
unit is allowed after completion of the first reading process and before the second
reading process is started.

20.   Regarding Claims 17 and 27, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing
method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting
of a command to display image data stored in the image storage unit on the
display unit is enabled.

         Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein in response to
completion of the first reading process, inputting of a command to display image
data stored in the image storage unit on the display unit is enabled (CPU is
capable of transferring the image data read out of the image data to the
operation panel vial the I/O panel) (col. 6, lines 33-38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to visually verify the images that have been scanned.

21.   Regarding Claims 18 and 28, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of the read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, wherein in response to completion of the first reading process, inputting of the read-end command in the successive reading operation is enabled (address and data lines for reading and writing) (col. 6, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to end the scanning process.

22.   Regarding Claims 20 and 30, Kita et al fails to teach an image processing method, further comprising instructing suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets; and resuming the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the instruction.

Michiie et al teaches an image processing method, further comprising instructing suspension of the successive reading operation for the series of document sheets; and resuming the suspended reading operation, wherein the interval is provided by the instruction (Fig. 9) (col. 7, lines 23-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita with the teaching of Michiie to allow a user to control the timing of the scanning process.

23.

24.   Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kita et al and Michiie et al as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Kanda (US 7,212,307).

25.   Regarding Claim 6, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image processing apparatus, further comprising- a re-read unit configured to re-read a document page by the image reading unit and replace data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising- a re-read unit configured to re-read a document page by the image reading unit and replace data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image date for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

26.   Regarding Claim 9, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image

processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-

read a document page by the image reading unit and replace image data

currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-

reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read

command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page by the image

reading unit and replace image data currently displayed on the display unit with

image data obtained by the re-reading (image date for each page are read out by

means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6,

lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with

the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output

image and make sure the correct image is being output.

27.   Regarding Claim 16 and 26, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an

image processing method, further comprising- re-reading a document page; and

replacing image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the

display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, further comprising- re-

reading a document page; and replacing image data corresponding to image

data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-

reading (image date for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

28.   Regarding Claim 19 and 29, Kita et al and Michiie et al fail to teach an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page and replace image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading.

Kanda teaches an image processing apparatus, wherein a re-read command is allowed to be input to re-read a document page and replace image data corresponding to image data currently displayed on the display unit with image data obtained by the re-reading (image date for each page are read out by means of the memory/HDD control section for a set number of times) (col. 6, lines 17-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Kita and Michiie with the teaching of Kanda to re-read the image data to prevent errors in the output image and make sure the correct image is being output.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATWANT K. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward L. Coles/   /Satwant K. Singh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625   Examiner, Art Unit 2625

sks